

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed April 2, 2007. In the office action the Examiner:

- objected to claim 25 for containing an informality;
- objected to the specification, and in particular paragraphs 0047 and 0061;
- objected to the drawings, and in particular Figure 4B and Figure 9A;
- rejected claims 1-58 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter;
- rejected claims 1, 27 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218);
- rejected claims 2-3, 18, 22, 28-29 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218)
- rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218) in view of Gerace (US 5,848,396);
- rejected claims 4-7, 9-17, 19-20, 23-24, 30-33, 35-42, 46-49, and 51-58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218) in view of König *et al.* (US 6,981,040);
- rejected claims 8, 34, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218) in view of König *et al.* (US 6,981,040) further in view of Gabriel *et al.* (US 6,584,468); and
- rejected claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese *et al.* (US 6,006,218) in view of König *et al.* (US 6,981,040) further in view of Dumais *et al.* (US 2004/0267700).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-58.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 18, 27, and 43 (as well as some of their associated dependent claims) have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 9A and 9B and their related text in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings and Specification

Applicant notes that the Examiner's objections to the specification are drawn to paragraphs numbered according to the published application (US 2005/0071328). The

paragraph numbering in the published application differs from that of the specification as filed.

Applicant has amended paragraph 0044 of the application as filed to correctly refer to the elements of Figure 4B. This amendment is believed to address the Examiner's objection to Figure 4B as well, since all numbered elements in Figure 4B are now recited in the specification.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the word "value" in the pseudo code in paragraph 0061, Applicant respectfully notes that this word was correctly spelled in paragraph 0058 of the originally submitted specification.

Paragraph 0070 of the application as filed has been amended to recite the numbered element 945 shown in Figure 9A. Applicant believes this amendment overcomes the Examiner's objection to Figure 9A.

The Examiner has objected to the title of the application as not being sufficiently descriptive. Applicant in this Amendment has requested that the title of the application be amended to that suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's approval of these amendments and corresponding withdrawal of objections to the figures and specification is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claim 25, specifically the occurrence of "scored" which should be changed to "scores." This change has been made and it is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-58 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 18 has been amended to further recite "providing the ranked set of search result documents to the user," and a similar element has been added to claim 1, and thus the claimed method generates a useful, concrete and tangible result. Independent claims 27 and 43 have been amended to recite similar limitations.

The Examiner also rejected claims 43-58 as being software *per se* citing MPEP §2106. The Applicant submits the following excerpt from MPEP §2106.01:

In contrast, **a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program** is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and **is thus statutory**.
(*emphasis added*)

The preamble of claim 43 reads as follows:

A computer program product for use in conjunction with a computer system, the computer program product comprising **a computer readable storage medium and a computer program mechanism embedded therein** ... (*emphasis added*)

The highlighted portion of the preamble clearly meets MPEP's requirement of statutory subject matter. Thus, Applicant submits that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claimed Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 27 and 43 as being anticipated by Breese. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

“A method of personalizing search results of a search engine, comprising:
...
identifying a set of **generic** search result documents that match the search query [submitted by a first user];
...
receiving **the search query from a second user that is different from the first user**;
...
assigning a second personalized score to each document of **the plurality of identified search result documents** in accordance with the generic score assigned to the document and **the second user profile**;
ranking the set of search result documents into **a second order** according to their second personalized scores; and
providing the ranked set of search result documents **in the second order to the second user.**” (*emphasis added*)

Breese teaches methods and apparatus for retrieving information and/or processing retrieved information as a function of a user's estimated knowledge. To retrieve information database entries relevant to a particular user, the search engine 130 uses the **user-specific** information stored in the user database 104:

In step 228, the information obtained from the user input device 170, **the user database 104** and the information database 106 is supplied to **the search engine 130** and the search result post-processor 231 as illustrated in FIG. 2A by lines 105 and 107. Col. 8, line 57-61 (*emphasis added*)

Breese does not teach or suggest the feature of identifying (e.g., in a database) a set of **generic** search result documents in response to a search query and then returning the same set of generic search result documents in **different orders** to different users who submit the **same search query** in accordance with their respective user profiles.

Claims 27 and 43 have been amended in substantially the same manner. Therefore, for at least the reasons above, claims 1, 27, and 43 are not anticipated by Breese.

Claimed Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected other pending claims over Breese in view of other references under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses.

Claims 2-17, 28-42, and 44-58

Claims 2-3, 28-29, and 44-45 are dependent from claims 1, 27, and 43, respectively, and are therefore patentable over Breese for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant further notes that none of the other references discloses all the claimed features as discussed in the previous section.

Konig teaches a method of locating a set of search results from “the set containing all documents D and **user documents obtained during personal crawling**” (col. 27, lines 44-45). According to Konig, different users may have different sets of user documents, each set of user documents being of interest to that particular user. In response to the same search query from two different users, Konig requires two distinct search operations against two different corpuses of documents. The two search operations could produce two different sets of search results because the two users may not have the same set of user documents. Thus, it is impossible for Konig to identify a set of **generic** search results and re-order it in accordance with different users’ user profile as recited in claims 1, 27, and 43.

Gabriel was cited by the Examiner to reject claims 8, 34, and 50. It does not disclose the features as recited in claims 1, 27, and 50. Nor does the Examiner claim so.

Thus, dependent claims 4-17, 30-42, and 46-58 are all patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 18-26

Independent claim 18, as amended, is directed to a personalized search method that includes the limitations “generating **a personalized query strategy** from the search query and the user profile” and “selecting a **personalized** set of **documents** from the Internet according to the personalized query strategy.”

Breese does not teach or suggest a method of generating a personalized query strategy. Nor does Breese disclose selecting a personalized set of documents from the Internet using a personalized query strategy.

Further, Applicant is unable to find evidence that any of the other references discloses all the features recited in claim 18. Gerace discloses a method of creating user profiles, which was cited to reject claim 21. Gerace does not teach or suggest a method of generating a personalized search strategy. Similarly, Dumais teaches relates to systems and methods providing content-access-based information retrieval, which was cited to reject claims 25-26. According to Konig (Figure 19), a set of search results is first located from the set containing all documents D and user documents obtained during personal crawling (192) and then personalized using a user’s User Model (194). There is no personalized search strategy involved in the step 192.

In sum, claims 18-26 are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner for at least the reasons mentioned above.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2007

/ Gary S. Williams / Gary S. Williams MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306 (650) 843-4000	31,066 (Reg. No.)
---	----------------------